

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-14 currently remain in the application. Claim 1 is herein amended, and claims 12-14 are newly added claims.

Claims 1-7 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Tabata in view of Iwama.

In analyzing Tabata in the Official Letter, the Examiner considered its "main CPU 34" as an element that may be considered an equivalent of the terminal table unit of the present invention. The terminal table unit of the present invention, however, is intended to be a terminal table unit, not a computer. In other words, what is intended to be called a terminal table unit in the present invention is a product which an ordinary purchaser would identify as a terminal table unit, rather than a computer.

In page 3 of said Official Letter, the Examiner seems to be advancing the opinion that Tabata is describing all of the characteristics of the control device of claim 1 herein, for example, but the portion of Tabata in column 3 at lines 33-42, specifically pointed out by the Examiner, does not seem to be characterizing its CPU 34 as "being adapted to receive input data from an input apparatus for controlling an output apparatus and to drive said output apparatus according to said received input data" (required according to claim 1 herein) because Tabata's Fig. 1 does not seem to be showing such relationship between sensors and switch signals on the input side and the output signals.

Applicant admits, however, that claim 1 as originally submitted did not make the aforementioned intention sufficiently clear. For this reason, claim 1 is herein amended such that what is referred to as a terminal table unit therein is now characterized (or is required to be characterized) as having a surface with a connector connecting to a control device and a terminal table connecting to input and output apparatus. This additional limitation is clearly supported by the specification and hence should be deemed enterable. More importantly, Tabata's main CPU 34 does not satisfy this requirement, that is, it is not anywhere characterized as being so structured because Tabata's main CPU 34 is not intended to be a product to be sold, or intended to be regarded by a purchaser, as a terminal table unit.

Iwama was evidently cited merely for disclosing a memory cassette, itself being related principally to a mobile information recording device. In page 4 of said Official Letter, the Examiner interpreted Iwama as teaching the main body having a connector and a memory cassette, Iwama's Fig. 1 merely shows a flash memory 17 and a recorder unit 18

being connected. It would be rash to conclude therefrom that the characterization of claim 2 herein is being disclosed. Thus, even if Tabata and Iwama are considered in combination, there do not result likes of the terminal table unit of the present invention as characterized in claim 1 as amended herein. It is therefore believed that claim 1 is now in condition for allowance.

Allowability of claim 8 is noted but this is now a moot point.

New claims 12-14 are merely intended to further characterize the kinds of switches that may be connected and are amply supported by the specification.

In summary, it is believed that the present Amendment is totally responsive to the Office Action and hence that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Applicant takes this opportunity to simultaneously submit a priority document.

Respectfully submitted,



Keiichi Nishimura
Registration No. 29,093

March 28, 2006
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP
500 12th Street, Suite 200
Oakland, California 94607
Telephone: (510) 663-1100
Telefax: (510) 663-0920